

Remarks

Claims 1-15 are pending in the application. Claims 1-9 are rejected, and claims 10-15 are withdrawn from consideration. Based on the following, reconsideration of the pending claims is requested.

Election/Restrictions

Applicants hereby affirm the provisional election to prosecute claims 1-9.

Specification

The Examiner states that the title of the invention is not descriptive, and that a new title is required. By this paper, the title of the application is amended to conform with the Examiner's request. In addition, the specification is amended to update the status of the parent application, which is now an issued U.S. patent.

Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). In particular, the Examiner stated that the inlet diffuser vanes formed on the front cover must be shown.

By this paper, drawing Figure 9 is amended to conform with the Examiner's request. Applicants note that the diffuser vanes, labeled 81 in Figure 9, were shown in Figure 9 as originally submitted. The vanes were, however, difficult to distinguish from the surrounding fluid space because they did not include any shading or marks to help distinguish them from their background. As clearly shown in new Figure 9, the inlet diffuser vanes now include a shading which distinguishes them from the fluid space. As noted above, the diffuser

vanes were shown and labeled in the original drawing figures, and therefore, no new matter has been added by this replacement drawing.

Double Patenting

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 6 and 7 of U.S. Patent No. 6,659,737 (Bader et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,520,880 (Harlamoff). In addition, the Examiner rejected claim 9 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of Bader et al. in view of Harlamoff and U.S. Patent No. 5,401,146 (Moriya et al.).

Filed with this amendment is a Terminal Disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(c). Because each of the claim rejections is based on obviousness-type double patenting, it is believed that the filing of the Terminal Disclaimer overcomes each of the claim rejections. Accordingly, allowance of each of the pending claims is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Bader et al.

By Marc F. Malooley
Marc F. Malooley
Reg. No. 50,624
Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: November 12, 2004

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351

S/N: 10/642,881
Reply to Office Action of August 24, 2004

Atty Dkt No. EMP 0120 PUS2

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 9. This sheet, which includes only Fig. 9, replaces the original sheet which included only Fig. 9.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet